



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/727,767	12/04/2003	Fabrizio Di Franco	NRC.0021US	7581
21906 7590 02/20/2007 TROP PRUNER & HU, PC 1616 S. VOSS ROAD, SUITE 750 HOUSTON, TX 77057-2631			EXAMINER NGUYEN, LE V	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2174	
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		02/20/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/727,767

Applicant(s)

DI FRANCO ET AL.

Examiner

Le Nguyen

Art Unit

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-39 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-39 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: it appears "DropZone button (10)" contains a typographical error and should be changed to DropZone button (12) (lines 13 and 18 of section [0070] of the published application as well as line 3 of section [0071], lines 4 and 9 of section [0072], line 9 of section [0074], line 2 of sections [0073], [0075] and [0077]).

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 5 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 5 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. It is unclear whether by "name/value pairs", applicant meant "name-value pairs" or "name or value pairs". Therefore, the Office will interpret "name/value pairs" to mean the former, i.e. name-value pairs.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-9, 11-29, 31-35 and 36-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hitchcock et al. ("Hitchcock") in view of Atlas et al. ("Atlas").

As per claims 1, 19 and 20, Hitchcock teaches a method operating on a computing device for the storage of display values from one or more fields of a form of a graphical user interface (GUI) application running on the computing device and a computer program element comprising computer program code to make a computing device execute the method and embodied in or on a computer readable medium comprising in response to a save command by a user of the computing device in relation to a form, for each field of the form containing display values, saving the display values in a data storage file (col. 2, lines 4-16; col. 21, lines 13-30), and in response to a load command by a user in relation to an open form and a designated or default data storage file, populating the fields of the form with the display values stored in the file (col. 2, lines 15-21). Hitchcock does not explicitly disclose the form being an open form. Atlas teaches a method of populating the data fields of an open form (figs. 2-6). It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Atlas with the method of Hitchcock in order to override the automatic feature and provide for manual editing in cases where updating a particular information or correcting

Art Unit: 2174

specific errors are necessary on an individual bases within an organization without having to refill the whole form, thereby, providing a user friendly interface for data entry.

As per claim 2, the modified Hitchcock teaches a method operating on a computing device for the storage of display values from one or more fields of a form of a graphical user interface (GUI) application running on the computing device comprising storing the display values in the data storage file in a user editable format (Hitchcock: col. 2, lines 4-16; col. 21, lines 13-30; Atlas: col. 4, lines 1-63).

As per claim 3, the modified Hitchcock teaches a method operating on a computing device for the storage of display values from one or more fields of a form of a graphical user interface (GUI) application running on the computing device comprising storing a correlation for each field of the form in the data storage file wherein each correlation is a correlation between a field element identifier in the GUI application for that field and the display value for that field (Hitchcock: col. 2, lines 4-16; col. 21, lines 13-30; *correlation between a field element identifier in the GUI application for that field and the display value for that field is inherent in order to populate the fields with the corresponding data*).

As per claim 4, the modified Hitchcock teaches a method operating on a computing device for the storage of display values from one or more fields of a form of a graphical user interface (GUI) application running on the computing device comprising storing a correlation for each field of the form in the data storage file in a user editable format wherein each correlation is a correlation between a field element identifier in the

Art Unit: 2174

GUI application for that field and the display value for that field (Hitchcock: col. 2, lines 4-16; col. 21, lines 13-30; Atlas: col. 4, lines 1-63).

As per claim 5, although the modified Hitchcock teaches a method operating on a computing device for the storage of display values from one or more fields of a form of a graphical user interface (GUI) application running on the computing device comprising storing a correlation for each field of the form in the data storage file and using name-value pairs (Hitchcock: col. 2, lines 4-16; col. 21, lines 13-30), Hitchcock does not explicitly disclose capturing the relationship/correlation between the data field and the data name-value. Official Notice is taken that it is common to capture the relationship/correlation between the data field and the data name-value. Another way of doing this is to retain the order of the data fields without using name-value pairs; however, if one field were removed, the relationship/correlation between the data field and the displayed data would be lost. Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to incorporate capturing the relationship/correlation between the data field and the data name and value and listing GUI application element name in relation to the data with the method of the modified Hitchcock given that it is a more robust and flexible way to model data structures that are not predefined

As per claim 6, the modified Hitchcock teaches a method operating on a computing device for the storage of display values from one or more fields of a form of a graphical user interface (GUI) application running on the computing device wherein in response to a save command by a user of the computing device in relation to an open form, for each field of the form containing display values, the method additionally

Art Unit: 2174

comprises creating a correlation comprising a field element identifier in the GUI application for that field and the display value for that field and storing the one or more created correlations in a data storage file, and in response to a load command by a user in relation to an open form and a designated or default data storage file, identifying each field where a match occurs between the field element identifiers of the fields of the form and the field element identifiers of the correlations in the file and populating each such identified field of the form with the display value stored in the file for the matched correlation (Hitchcock: col. 21, line 13 through col. 22, line 13).

As per claim 7, the modified Hitchcock teaches a method operating on a computing device for the storage of display values from one or more fields of a form of a graphical user interface (GUI) application running on the computing device wherein the fields are box fields and the display values are data displayed in boxes on the form (Hitchcock: fig. 12b; col. 5, lines 27-47; col. 19, lines 60-62).

As per claim 8, the modified Hitchcock teaches a method operating on a computing device for the storage of display values from one or more fields of a form of a graphical user interface (GUI) application running on the computing device wherein the fields are data type descriptor fields and the display values are data type descriptors (Hitchcock: col. 16, line 1-44).

As per claim 9, the modified Hitchcock teaches a method operating on a computing device for the storage of display values from one or more fields of a form of a graphical user interface (GUI) application running on the computing device comprising: in response to a request from a user, displaying the form on a display of the computing

Art Unit: 2174

device for a user to input display values in fields of the form and displaying a activator icon on the form, and in response to a user actuating the activator icon, displaying an array of options including a save command actuator and a load command actuator (figs. 6(a-d)).

As per claim 11, although the modified Hitchcock teaches a method operating on a computing device for the storage of display values from one or more fields of a form of a graphical user interface (GUI) application running on the computing device wherein the form has a title and saving the display values in a data storage file is automatic and comprises generating a file in a default location of the computing device, and storing the display values in the file (Hitchcock: col. 2, lines 4-16; col. 21, lines 13-30), Hitchcock does not explicitly disclose naming the file after the title of the form. Official Notice is taken that naming the file after title of the form when generating a file in a default location of the computing device is well known in the art. It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to incorporate naming the file after title of the form when generating a file in a default location of the computing device with the method of the modified Hitchcock in order to provide a familiar reference point during a search when recovering the file in the event of a computer crash.

As per claim 12, the modified Hitchcock teaches a method operating on a computing device for the storage of display values from one or more fields of a form of a graphical user interface (GUI) application running on the computing device wherein populating the fields of the form with the display values stored in the file, comprises displaying a file picker window for a user to select a data storage file from which to load

Art Unit: 2174

the display values (Hitchcock: figs. 6(a-d); col. 22, lines 9-14; Atlas: figs. 2-6; col. 4, lines 1-63).

As per claim 13, although the modified Hitchcock teaches a method operating on a computing device for the storage of display values from one or more fields of a form of a graphical user interface (GUI) application running on the computing device wherein the form has a title and populating the fields of the form with the display values stored in the file is automatic and comprises selecting a file from which to load the display values (Hitchcock: col. 2, lines 4-16; col. 21, lines 13-30; Atlas: col. 4, lines 1-63), the modified Hitchcock does not explicitly disclose selecting a file in a default location with the same name as the title of the form. Official Notice is taken that naming the file after title of the form when generating a file in a default location of the computing device is well known in the art. It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to incorporate naming the file after title of the form when generating a file in a default location of the computing device with the method of the modified Hitchcock in order to provide a familiar reference point during a search.

As per claim 14, the modified Hitchcock teaches a method operating on a computing device for the storage of display values from one or more fields of a form of a graphical user interface (GUI) application running on the computing device wherein in response to a user designating a data storage file as a default file for a form, automatically populating the fields of the form with the display values stored in the file when a new version of the form is opened (Hitchcock: col. 2, lines 4-16; col. 21, lines 13-30; Atlas: col. 4, lines 1-63).

As per claim 15, although the modified Hitchcock teaches a method operating on a computing device for the storage of display values from one or more fields of a form of a graphical user interface (GUI) application running on the computing device comprising storing a correlation for each field of the form in the data storage file and using name-value pairs (Hitchcock: col. 2, lines 4-16; col. 21, lines 13-30), Hitchcock does not explicitly disclose display a screen listing GUI application element name in relation to the data. Official Notice is taken that it is common to list GUI application element name in relation to the data as is done with standard integrated devices where there are listing of variables and highlighting of the places where the variable are used, which corresponds to the field names and the relationship between the field names and the data fields. Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to incorporate listing GUI application element name in relation to the data with the method of the modified Hitchcock so that you know which data values correspond to which data field.

As per claim 16, the modified Hitchcock teaches a method operating on a computing device for the storage of display values from one or more fields of a form of a graphical user interface (GUI) application running on the computing device wherein in response to a request by a user, displaying the contents of a data storage file on a display of the computing device in a user editable format (Hitchcock: figs. 6(a-d); Atlas: figs. 2-6; col. 4, lines 1-63).

As per claim 17, the modified Hitchcock teaches a method operating on a computing device for the storage of display values from one or more fields of a form of a

Art Unit: 2174

graphical user interface (GUI) application running on the computing device comprising generating an activation interface which is actuable by the user to facilitate storage of display values to a data storage file or loading of display values from a data storage file (Hitchcock: figs. 6(a-d)).

As per claim 18, the modified Hitchcock teaches a method operating on a computing device for the storage of display values from one or more fields of a form of a graphical user interface (GUI) application running on the computing device comprising displaying an activation interface on the open form which is actuable by the user to facilitate storage of display values to a data storage file or loading of display values from a data storage file (Hitchcock: figs. 6(a-d)).

Claims 21 and 39 in combination is similar in scope to the combination of claims 1, 19 and 20 and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 22 is similar in scope to the combination of claims 1, 2, 19 and 20 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 23 is similar in scope to the combination of claims 1, 3, 19 and 20 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 24 is similar in scope to the combination of claims 1, 4, 19 and 20 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 25 is similar in scope to the combination of claims 1, 5, 19 and 20 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 26 is similar in scope to the combination of claims 1, 6, 19 and 20 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Art Unit: 2174

Claim 27 is similar in scope to the combination of claims 1, 7, 19 and 20 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 28 is similar in scope to the combination of claims 1, 8, 19 and 20 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 29 is similar in scope to the combination of claims 1, 9, 19 and 20 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 31 is similar in scope to the combination of claims 1, 11, 19 and 20 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 32 is similar in scope to the combination of claims 1, 12, 19 and 20 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 33 is similar in scope to the combination of claims 1, 13, 19 and 20 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 34 is similar in scope to the combination of claims 1, 14, 19 and 20 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 35 is similar in scope to the combination of claims 1, 15, 19 and 20 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 36 is similar in scope to the combination of claims 1, 16, 19 and 20 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 37 is similar in scope to the combination of claims 1, 17, 19 and 20 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 38 is similar in scope to the combination of claims 1, 18, 19 and 20 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Art Unit: 2174

6. Claims 10 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hitchcock et al. ("Hitchcock") in view of Atlas et al. ("Atlas"), and further in view of Screen Dumps of Microsoft Word 2000 (MS Word).

As per claim 10, the modified Hitchcock teaches a method operating on a computing device for the storage of display values from one or more fields of a form of a graphical user interface (GUI) application running on the computing device wherein saving the display values in a data storage file (Hitchcock: col. 2, lines 4-16; col. 21, lines 13-30), Hitchcock does not explicitly disclose a file save window for a user to create or select a file in which to save the data. MS Word teaches a file save window for a user to create or select a file in which to save the data (figs. 2-3; *users may select create a new file by typing in a name such as "Sample" within the "File name:" field or select an existing Word icon to save the data*). It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of MS Word with the method of the modified Hitchcock so that users may have more control in organizing their files and in a way that is meaningful for easy retrieval.

Claim 30 is similar in scope to the combination of claims 1, 10, 19 and 20 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Young et al. (US 2002/0111922) teach auto-population of specified fields.

Art Unit: 2174

Inquires

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Examiner Lê Nguyen whose telephone number is **(571) 272-4068**. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 7:00 am to 3:30 pm (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid, can be reached at (571) 272-4063.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

LVN

Patent Examiner

January 4, 2007

Kristine Kincaid
KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100